

REMARKS

Applicants have replaced claims 26-50 with new claims 51-67. The new claims are based on claims 1-16 of the parent application (now U.S. Patent No. 6,339,197), except that (1) the preamble of new claims 51-66 recite "a printed wiring board," rather than "a multilayer printed wiring board," (2) the new independent claims recite only one wiring layer on each surface of the substrate, rather a plurality of wiring layers, and (3) no insulating layers are recited. In the event that new claims 51-67 are entered, it is Applicants' intent to cancel claim 25. Applicants submit that new claim 67 is supported by Fig. 1 which shows an adhesion-reinforcing layer as claimed.

Applicants therefore request entry of the new claims. With respect to the issued parent application, Applicants attached a Terminal Disclaimer.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 25-26, 28-29, 33-34 and 36-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,096,626 to Olsen *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,840,201 to Elledge.

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Olsen and Elledge, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,435,718 to Clark *et al.* Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Olsen and Elledge, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,266,446 to Chang *et al.* Finally, claims 27, 31-32 and 35 are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

A. The Examiner's Position

The Olsen patent is cited for the disclosure of a charge electrode 20 made of photosensitive glass layers 30. The layers are subjected to steps of etching, stacking, heat-treating(bonding) and metalizing (forming conducting circuits) (3: 30-43, 4: 7-11, 22-29, claim1).

The Examiner admits that Olsen fails to disclose crystallizing the substrate having through holes therein, but asserts that Elledge abstract discloses this step and that it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to include the crystallization step of Elledge (3: 28-30) in the process of Olsen.

With respect to claim 29, the Examiner argues that variation of line width would be obvious; with respect to 30, the Examiner asserts that Clark *et al.* would motivate one skilled in the art to cover the holes; and for claim 34, the Examiner argues that Chang et al. would motivate one skilled in the art to form an adhesion-reinforcing layers.

B. Applicants' Response

Applicants traverse the rejection because Elledge is not analogous prior art to Olsen. Specifically, Elledge relates to the manufacture of large area field emission displays, not multi-layers laminated charge plates as in Olsen. Further, there is nothing within the references indicating that crystallization would have the new desirable effect in Olsen as it does in Elledge. Applicants therefore request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

C. Conclusion


In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Scott M. Daniels

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32,562

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SMD/mlj